

COPY

Remarks

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected.
The claims have not been amended.

The title has been amended per the request of the Examiner.

Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadri, U.S. Pat. No. 6,690,652 in view of Olofsson et al. ("Olofsson"), U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,031. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding Claim 1, Sadri and Olofsson at least fails to teach or suggest "selecting transmitter parameters as a function of the prediction of fast flat fading."

The Office Action states that "Sadri does not specifically teach selecting transmitting parameters as a function of the prediction of fast flat fading." Further, the Office Action asserts that Olofsson discloses "selecting transmitting parameters as a function of the fast flat fading" with reference to Olofsson, Col. 12, lines 6-17 and Fig. 8. However, Olofsson uses measured link quality parameters to calculate mean values and variances of the parameters and determines, using a link quality estimation function, whether a new combination of modulation and channel coding schemes on an RF link should be selected. (Olofsson, Col. 12, lines 6-17). The link quality estimation function maps the channel characteristic measures with estimated user quality values for the supported combinations of modulation and coding schemes. (Olofsson, Col. 11, lines 47-62.) The use of measured values to calculate mean values and variances and to map to estimated user quality values is not the same predicting fast flat fading. Therefore,

COPY

Olofsson does not teach or suggest "selecting transmitter parameters as a function of the prediction of fast flat fading."

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Sadri and Olofsson, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. The rejection of Claim 1 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 2-11 depend from allowable Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 12

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadri, U.S. Pat. No. 6,690,652 in view of Olofsson et al. ("Olofsson"), U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,031. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 12 requires "a fading adaptive unit for selecting transmitter parameters as a function of the prediction of fast flat fading." For similar reasons as given with reference to Claim 1, Sadri and Olofsson, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 12. The rejection of Claim 12 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 13-22 depend from allowable Claim 12 and are allowable for at least this reason.

COPY

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: 6/22/04Rita M. WisorRita M. Wisor
Reg. No. 41,382

Attorney Phone Number:

(512) 732-3923

Correspondence Address:

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026